REMARKS

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

The outstanding Office Action mailed February 19, 2008 has been duly received and its contents carefully considered. The following remarks and above amendments are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action, when coupled with the above amendments, to render all claims patentable.

A substitute specification has been submitted to adhere to the arrangement of the specification as set forth in the outstanding Office Action, with section headings properly incorporated therein.

Claims 4 and 7-10 have been amended without any new matter introduced therein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 5-10 are objected to as being of improper form due to a multiple dependent claim

4. In response thereto, claims 4 and 7-10 have been amended to correct the improper multiple
dependency. No new matter has been introduced.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C.§ 102

Claims 1, 2 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable by Holloman (US Patent No. 6,288,696, hereinafter referred to as "Holloman").

Referring to claim 1, the Examiner has indicated that *Holloman* discloses each and every claimed element. However, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 specifically requires that each pixel has circuitry for providing a feedback signal or signals representing the voltage drop across the current sampling resistor to at least one feedback line. No such claimed element or limitation is found in *Holoman* since the voltage in *Holloman* is fed directly to the comparator. Particularly, as illustrated in Fig. 1 and discussed in the description on last two lines of column 2 of *Holloman*, the voltage developed on the feedback resistor 30 is fed to the negative input 21 of comparator 22. Accordingly, *Holloman* fails to mention any circuitry for providing one or more feedback signals

representing the voltage drop across the resistor. Additionally, Holloman does not disclose any feedback line, to which the respective feedback signal is provided thereto. Indeed, the comparator disclosed in Holloman does not even process driving signals which depend on the feedback signal(s).

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner asserts that the transistor 32 as shown in Fig. 1 of *Holloman* corresponds to the first sampling transistor of the circuitry for providing a feedback signal or signals. However, as described in column 3, line 6-9 of *Holloman*, the transistor 32 is a reset FET. The reset FET 32 is provided in parallel with the storage capacitor 18 to remove the charge upon the storage capacitor 18 thereby blocking all current from passing through LED 100. The reset FET 32 cannot provide a feedback signal representing the voltage drop across the resistor as required by claim 2. It is also noted that the resistor 104, as shown in Fig. 1 of *Holloman*, is a leakage resistor representing the leakage resistor for the comparator 22.

As to claim 11, Holloman does not disclose obtaining a feedback signal representing the current flowing through the display element by sampling a voltage on the terminals of the resistor in series with the EL display element. Holloman does not disclose sampling the voltage of the terminals of the resistor to get a feedback signal. Accordingly, claim 11 should be patentable.

Claims 13 and 14 are patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 11 due to their dependency thereof.

As to claim 12, which depends from claim 1 and includes further limitations, it is also patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 1.

Referring to claim 15, Holloman does not even disclose the feedback signal representing the voltage drop across the current sampling resistor, much less the method of storing the feedback signal and using the stored feedback signal as the feedback control signal. Moreover, as discussed, e.g., by claim 2 of Holloman, the means for controlling current includes an operational amplifier, the positive input thereof receives a voltage substantially equal to the voltage across the capacitor, the negative input of the operation amplifier receives a voltage substantially equal to the voltage across the feedback resistor. As such, no feedback signal representing the voltage across the resistor is involved.

Claims 16 and 17 are patentable for the at least the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 15 due to the their dependency thereof.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C.§ 103

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Holloman*.

Regarding claim 3, *Holloman* does not teach or suggest the circuitry for providing a feedback signal or feedback signals representing the voltage drop across the resistor. The reset FET 32 of *Holloman* cannot be deemed as the first sample transistor as set forth in claim 3 of the present application. Therefore, the "second sampling transistor" is not obvious in view of *Holloman*.

Regarding claim 4, Holloman does teach or suggest an address transistor. Additionally, Holloman fails to teach that the gates of the address transistor and each sampling transistor are controlled by a shared address line. Indeed, Holloman fails to even mention any sampling transistor, much less the sampling transistor with the same or similar function and effect as set that set forth in claim 4.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims as currently amended or presented are in condition of allowance and hereby respectfully request reconsideration.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond J. Ho

Registration No.: 41,838

VENABLE LLP P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant

RJH/srj

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- a Substitute SpecificationMarked-Up Copy